

### REMARKS

1. Claims 1-16 are pending and stand rejected.

Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

2. The drawings stand objected to because the boxes shown FIGS. 1-5 are not provided with descriptive text labels. In response, submitted herewith for the Examiner's approval are five (5) replacement sheets of the drawings which correct FIGS. 1-5. In the drawings, FIGS. 1-5 have been amended to include descriptive text labels for the boxes shown therein. No new matter is believed entered by these amendments.

3. The abstract of the disclosure stands objected to because of some minor informalities. In response, the abstract has been amended to correct these informalities.

4. Paragraph 3 of the Office Action provides guidelines which illustrate a preferred layout for the specification of a utility application. According to 37 CFR 1.77(b), these guidelines are merely recommended, not required. Since the layout suggested in 37 CFR 1.7(b) is not mandatory, the specification has not been amended in accordance with these guidelines in order to maintain consistency with the corresponding priority application filed in France.

5. Claims 1-5, 7-9, and 11-16 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent 5,633,683 to Rosengren et al. (Rosengren).

This rejection is respectfully traversed because Rosengren does not teach or suggest all the features of each of the claims.

Claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, and 15 each require an association means or step for associating with each sub-sampled video signal a descriptor characterizing the corresponding coded video signal and a multiplexing means or step for multiplexing the group of the coded video signals with the group of the sub-sampled video signals associated with their descriptors. The Examiner acknowledges that Rosengren does not teach the association means or step but points out that Rosengren in column 4, lines 62-67, discloses an embodiment wherein "the mosaic picture is transmitted as a program comprising the elementary stream Em" and "the associated linking data is transmitted by using a descriptor in the program table." The Examiner then contends that the Rosengren transmitter can be modified to include the claimed associating means, with the motivation

for making such a modification coming from column 10, lines 3-15 (claims 17-19) of Rosengren. Claims 17-19 of Rosengren recite:

17. An MPEG2 television signal including a plurality of digital video signals, each signal being transform-coded into a respective elementary bitstream, a further elementary bitstream representing a mosaic picture comprising a plurality of sub-pictures, each sub-picture representing one of said plurality of video signals, and linking data for linking each sub-picture within the mosaic picture with the video signal each sub-picture represents.

18. A signal as claimed in claim 17, wherein said linking data is transmitted by using an MPEG2 descriptor.

19. A signal as claimed in claim 17, wherein the respective elementary bitstreams include autonomously encoded and predictively encoded pictures comprising transform coded blocks having DC-coefficients, and wherein the further elementary bitstream comprises the DC coefficients of said autonomously encoded pictures.

It is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in Rosengren including the text of column 4, lines 62-67 and the language of claims 17-19, that teaches or suggests an association means or step for associating with each sub-sampled video signal a descriptor characterizing the corresponding coded video signal and a multiplexing means or step for multiplexing the group of the coded video signals with the group of the sub-sampled video signals associated with their descriptors, as required by claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, and 15. For at least these reasons, claims 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, and 15 are patentable over Rosengren.

Further regarding claims 2, 12 and 15, Rosengren does not teach or suggest the claimed transcoding means or step for supplying a sub-sampled video signal from each coded video signal. Rosengren, instead, teaches decoders 16-18 in FIG. 3.

Claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 16 each require among other features:

means (or step) for receiving an auxiliary signal resulting from the multiplexing of a group of sub-sampled video signals, each sub-sampled video signal resulting from the sub-sampling of a coded video signal, a data descriptor

being associated with each sub-sampled signal in order to characterize it by means of a group of fields,

means (or step) for creating a database in which to store fields of said data descriptors and to identify a sub-sampled video signal by means of a request referring to a group of fields.

The Examiner alleges that Rosengren teaches or suggests the above subject matter in column 8, lines 9-35 (claims 10 and 11) and in FIG. 7 of Rosengren. It is respectfully submitted that there is nothing in Rosengren including the language of claims 10 and 11, and the drawing of FIG. 7 that teaches or suggests the above features. Specifically, Rosengren does not teach or suggest the claimed auxiliary signal receiving means or step at least because Rosengren does not teach or suggest a data descriptor being associated with each sub-sampled signal, as required by the claimed auxiliary signal receiving means feature. Also, Rosengren does not teach or suggest the claimed database creating means of step at least because Rosengren does not teach or suggest the claimed data descriptors associated with each sub-sampled signal which are to be stored in the claimed database creating means. For at least these reasons, claims 3, 4, 5, 7, 8, 9, 13, and 16 are patentable over Rosengren.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

6. Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosengren as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,539,545 to Dureau et al. (Dureau).

The arguments set forth above regarding the deficiencies of Rosengren respecting claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. The patent to Dureau does not cure the deficiencies discussed above in Rosengren, because Dureau does not teach or suggest the association means and the multiplexing means required by claim 6, via its dependency on claim 1. For at least this reason, claim 6 is patentable over Rosengren in view of Dureau.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

7. Claim 10 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Rosengren as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent 6,377,309 to Ito et al. (Ito).

The arguments set forth above regarding the deficiencies of Rosengren respecting claim 1 are incorporated herein by reference. Ito does not cure the deficiencies discussed above regarding Rosengren, because Ito does not teach or suggest "each MPEG-4 video signal being associated with a descriptor characterizing the corresponding primary video signal," as required by claim 10. For at least this reason, claim 10 is patentable over Rosengren in view of Ito.

In view of the foregoing, withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully urged.

8. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested as it is believed that all outstanding issues have been addressed herein and, further, that claims 1-16 are in condition for allowance. Should there be any questions or matters whose resolution may be advanced by a telephone call, the examiner is cordially invited to contact applicants' undersigned attorney at his number listed below.

9. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any additional filing fees required under 37 CFR 1.16 and any patent application processing fees under 37 CFR 1.17, which are associated with this communication, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-2061.

Respectfully submitted,



Paul A. Schwarz  
Registration No. 37,577

Duane Morris LLP  
P.O. Box 5203  
Princeton, NJ 08543-5203  
609-631-2446- Tel  
609-631-2401 - Fax

PTN\129996.1